UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,052	10/22/2003	Barry Charles Kilby	12406/83	7288
KENYON & K	7590 03/01/201 ¹ ENYON	EXAMINER		
One Broadway	10004	PANDYA, SUNIT		
New York, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/692,052	KILBY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	SUNIT PANDYA	3714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 Fe</u>	bruarv 2010.					
/ <u> </u>	action is non-final.					
·=	/ 					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>31-34, 36-38, 40-55 & 57-61 are</u> is/ar	e pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>31-34, 36-38, 40-55 & 57-61 are</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte				

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/01/2010 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to amendments filed on 02/01/2010, wherein the examiner acknowledges that claims 31 & 53 have been amended, no new claims have been added or canceled; consequently, claims 31-34, 36-38, 40-55 & 57-61 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/692,052

Art Unit: 3714

Claims 31-34, 36-38, 40-55 & 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Healy (GB 2,231,189) in views of Goldberg et al. (US Patent 5,823,879).

Page 3

Claims 31 & 53: Healy discloses method for facilitating the play of a missing object location game comprising, providing a game image to the game player, the game image is configured to omit the missing object from the game image, providing coordinates associated with the game image and displaying an image of the missing object at a current location on the game image, pointed to by the pointing device (figures 3-5). Healy also discloses receiving from the players an indication of the player's guess as to the proper location of the missing object on the game image (pages 1-2, wherein the guess is a set of coordinates that corresponds to the location on the game image of the missing object, when the player's guess is indicated). Healy also discloses receiving the player's guess by receiving a location in the set of coordinates on the game image selected using a pointing device (wherein the coordinates are a set of X and Y grid, page 6, paragraph 3 & figure 4). In response to the player's guess, Healy determines whether the player has won the game, depending on the distance between the player's guess as to the proper location of missing object on the game image and the object's location (page 3, paragraph 3). Healy, however, fails to disclose feature that require player to enter a unique code via a network, and to play the game at a server.

In an analogous art of computer gaming system, Goldberg et al. teaches a network game, which allows users to access a game on a website by means of a Art Unit: 3714

security feature or code (figure 3 & col. 10: 11-30, wherein all the information could be stored at a game server), and the game is further played on the network server, by allowing players to connect on to the server from various locations (figure 7 & col. 14: 37-65). It would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the security features such as secure access gaming utilizing a server, as taught by Goldberg et al., in the game disclosed by Healy, in order to allow access to the game by certain players who have made purchase to participate in the game, and block players who have not.

Claims 32 & 54: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches the game being a picture of a sporting event including a ball, where the ball is omitted from the picture (Healy, figure 4).

Claims 33, 34, 42 & 55: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches accessing a game on a website by means of security feature such as secure login (figure 7 & col. 14: 29-65). However, Goldberg et al. does not explicitly state that the security code is stored on a ticket. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Goldberg et al. to include the security feature on a ticket, or barcodes or on magnetic strips, in order to make it easily accessible and portable for the players to use.

Claims 36-37 & 61: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches providing coordinates associated with the game image, and receiving the player's guess by receiving a location in the set of coordinates on the game image selected using a

Art Unit: 3714

pointing device (Healy, discloses the coordinates as a set of X and Y grid, page 6, paragraph 3).

Claim 38: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches a pointing device being a mouse (Healy, page 8, paragraph 2).

Claims 40 & 41: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches of receiving predetermined number of additional guesses from the player, wherein each guess indicating a corresponding location guess as to the proper location of the missing object, and displaying an image at the guess locations (Healy, figure 5 & page 6, paragraph 2).

Claim 43: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches determining the winning if the players' guess is within a predetermined distance of the actual location of the missing object (Healy, page 7).

Claims 44 & 45: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches determining the winner if the players' guess is within a predetermined distance of the actual location of the missing object (Healy, page 7), wherein a processor is configured to evaluate the distance to determine the winner, and a game programmer would find it within their means to be able to manipulate the processor thus controlling the distance to increase or decrease the number of winners.

Claim 46: Combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teach of receiving from plurality of player's respective guesses as to the proper location of the missing object in the game image (figures 3-5).

Claims 47-50 & 57-60: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches determining the winning if the players' guess is within a predetermined distance of the actual location of the missing object (Healy, page 7).

Claim 51: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches of communicating through an email regarding a players' game activity (Goldberg et al., col. 5: 4-25).

Claim 52: The combination of Healy and Goldberg et al. teaches displaying the game image with the missing object in the actual location (Healy, page 9).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 02/01/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues on page 8, that neither Healy, nor Goldberg et al. teach all of the claimed limitation, specifically, "displaying an image of the missing object at a current location on the game image pointed to by a pointing device", the examiner respectfully disagrees. Healy, in figure 3, displays the game image of the missing object at its current location, on the display device.

Regarding the applicant's arguments on page 8 that both Healy and Goldberg et al. fails to teach receiving from the player, at the game server, an indication of the player's guess as to the proper location of the missing object on the game image by receiving a location in the set of coordinates that corresponds to the current location on the game image of the missing object; the examiner respectfully disagrees. Healy

discloses receiving from the players an indication of the player's guess as to the correct location of the missing object, on the game image. On pages 1-2 & 5-6, Healy discloses allowing players to mark different locations on the game screen as to the correct location of the missing object, wherein the player's guess as to the location of the missing object guess, is a set of coordinates, which corresponds to the location on the game image of the missing object. The location selected by the player, as the guess, is automatically converted into a set of X and Y coordinates on the grid to verify if the player selected marking corresponds to the location on the game image of the missing object (page 6, paragraph 3 & figure 4). Healy, however, fails to disclose the game being played on a network utilizing a server. However, Healy's deficits have been corrected by Goldberg et al., who teaches a network game, which allows users to accessing a game on a website by means of a security feature or code (figure 3 & col. 10: 11-30, wherein all the information is stored at a game server), and the game could further be played on the network server, by allowing players to connect on to the server from various locations (figure 7 & col. 14: 37-65).

Thus, the combination of Healy and Goldberg et al., teaches all of the claimed limitations; consequently, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUNIT PANDYA whose telephone number is (571)272-2823. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8 - 5:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/692,052 Page 8

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dmitry Suhol can be reached on 571-272-4430. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JAMES S. MCCLELLAN/ Examiner, Art Unit 3714

SP